	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability		
	09/940,623 Examiner	HORIE, DAISAKU Art Unit
	Dennis Rosario	2621
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeal All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIOF the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in t or other appropriate commun IGHTS. This application is su	his application. If not included ication will be mailed in due course. THIS
1. This communication is responsive to <u>AF amt. 08/15/2005</u> .		
2. X The allowed claim(s) is/are 18-21,23-26,28 and 30-32.		
3. \boxtimes The drawings filed on <u>29 August 2001</u> are accepted by the	Examiner.	
 4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ur a) All b) Some* c) None of the: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * Certified copies not received: 	been received. been received in Application	No
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONM THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.		reply complying with the requirements
5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subm INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give		
6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") mus (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftspers 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Paper No./Mail Date Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the state of the property of the state of the stat	son's Patent Drawing Review . s Amendment / Comment or in .84(c)) should be written on the	n the Office action of drawings in the front (not the back) of
7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the depo- attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT		
Attachment(s)		·
1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)
2. Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	6. ☐ Interview Sur Paper No./M	nmary (PTO-413), lail Date
3. ☑ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No./Mail Date 08/29/01		mendment/Comment
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit		tatement of Reasons for Allowance
of Biological Material	9. 🗌 Other	
		CENT MANCE:

DETAILED ACTION

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with attorney of record, Edward J. Wise, Registration No. 34,523 on August 25, 2005.

The application has been amended as follows:

Claim 21, line 1 change "(Previously Presented)" to -(Currently Amended)-.

Claim 32, line 8 change "relevant" to -lightness component in a-.

Claim 32, line 8 insert -of the original image- after "portion".

Response to Amendment

1. The after final amendment was received on August 15, 2005. Claims 18-21,23-26,28,30-32.

Claim Objections

2. Due to the amendment, the objection to claims 21 and 31 is withdrawn.

Page 3

2. Applicant's arguments, see after final amendment, filed 8/15/2205, with respect to claims 18-21,23-26,28,30-32 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 18-21,23-26,28,30-32 has been withdrawn.

Regarding claims 18,23 and 28, applicants properly point out, stating on page 11, lines 2-5, "However, it is clear that there is no disclosure that a processor determines the edge that continuously extend from a first end of the extracted original region as corresponding to folds in the original image."

Instead, Ricard discloses a user and not a processor that determines the claimed region and mentions that the area is "relatively long and narrow" in col. 9, lines 46,47.

Hence, and in view of applicants arguments, amendment and in combination with all of the other elements of the claims, claims 18,23 and 28 are allowable over the closest prior art of Ricard (US Patent 6,731,795 B1).

Regarding claims 20,25 and 32, applicants properly point out, stating on page 11, lines 18022, "However, what claim 20 is directed to is that an edge is already detected by the edge detecting unit and then the processor determines whether or not this edge is a fold by determining whether regions on opposing sides of the edge (two regions separated by the edge) have attributes that are the same or not."

Instead, Ricard discloses a "user" in col. 6, line 15 and not a processor determining an edge or "rectangular area" in col. 6, line 16 that corresponds to a fold. In addition, Ricard discloses a set of criteria that define an edge where one of the criteria is a "difference... between pixels in the suspect area [or the claimed edge] and

neighboring pixels [or the claimed regions]" in col. 9, lines 45-47, which is a criteria that is different as claimed. Ricard does not suggest determining a difference between two neighboring pixels or the claimed regions to determine whether the neighboring pixels are the same or not.

Page 4

Hence, and in view of applicants arguments, amendment and in combination with all of the other elements of the claims, claims 20,25 and 32 are allowable over the closest prior art of Ricard.

Regarding claims 21,26 and 32, applicants properly point out, stating on page 12, line 3, "Independent claim 21 is more specific with respect to this subject matter [of claims 20,25 and 32]..."

Ricard does not teach the limitations of claims 21,26 and 32 of selecting an edge. Ricard may appear to be teaching the limitations of claims 21,26 and 32 in fig. 5, but figure 5 is directed towards a correction process after a fold is selected.

Hence, and in view of applicants arguments, amendment and in combination with all of the other elements of the claims, claims 21,26 and 32 are allowable over the closest prior art of Ricard.

Claim 31 is allowed for the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 19,24 and 30 are allowed for the same reasons stated in a previous office action of 2/22/2005, all of which is incorporated herein.

Art Unit: 2621

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Rosario whose telephone number is (571) 272-7397. The examiner can normally be reached on 6-3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso can be reached on (571) 272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Rosario Unit 2621

JEPH WIANGL